

REMARKS

The Examiner objected to claims 3, 5, 6, 13, 15, and 16 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 4, 7-12, 14 and 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by US 5,479,138 (hereafter Kuroda).

Applicants respectfully traverse the §102 rejections with the following arguments.

35 U.S.C. §102(b)

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 4, 7-12, 14 and 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by US 5,479,138 (hereafter Kuroda).

Applicants respectfully contend that Kuroda does not anticipate claim 1, because Kuroda does not teach each and every feature of claim 1. For example, Kuroda does not teach "a first electrically conductive strip across the opening in the first metal voltage plane includes the image of the first portion".

The Examiner identifies in FIGS. 1A and 1B of Kuroda: the first metal voltage plane G2 (which is geometrically the same as the voltage plane G1 shown in FIG. 1A of Kuroda) and the opening Gop in the first metal voltage plane G2. Applicants respectfully submit that there is no disclosure in FIGS. 1A and 1B of Kuroda, or in the description thereof in Kuroda, of a first electrically conductive strip across the opening in the first metal voltage plane. The only electrically conductive material disclosed by Kuroda are the electrically conductive wiring G2 which defines the first metal voltage plane G2 (similarly for G1) and the signal lines S1, S2, S3. The electrically conductive wiring is G2 not disposed "across the opening" Gop, as required by claim 1" but rather is disposed around the opening Gop. The signal lines S1, S2, S3 cannot be considered as candidates for the first electrically conductive strip of claim 1. For example, a first portion of the signal line S1 projects across the opening Gop. Thus, the signal line S2 cannot include the image that projects across the opening, since the projected image is by definition exits at the opening Gop where the projection occurs.

If the Examiner still considers the preceding feature of claim 1 to read on Kuroda, Applicants would appreciate it if the Examiner would provide an analysis identifying the first

electrically conductive strip in Kuroda and explaining why said first electrically conductive strip in Kuroda teaches or suggests the preceding feature of claim 1.

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully maintain that Kuroda does not anticipate claim 1, and that claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Since claims 2, 4, and 6-10 depend from claim 1, Applicants contend that claims 2, 4, and 6-10 are likewise in condition for allowance. However, the Examiner has already indicated that claim 6 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Applicants respectfully contend that Kuroda does not anticipate claim 11, because Kuroda does not teach each and every feature of claim 11. For example, Kuroda does not teach "an opening in the first metal voltage plane such that a first electrically conductive strip across the opening includes an image of a first portion of the metal signal line, wherein the image of the first portion of the metal signal line projects across the opening in the first metal voltage plane", based on the same arguments presented *supra* in relation to claim 1.

In addition, Kuroda does not teach "forming an opening in the first metal voltage plane such that a first electrically conductive strip across the opening includes an image of a first portion of the metal signal line, wherein the image of the first portion of the metal signal line projects across the opening in the first metal voltage plane." While Kuroda teaches an opening Gop in the grounding plane G2 (or G1), Kuroda does not teach forming the opening Gop in the grounding plane G2 (or G1).

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully maintain that Kuroda does not anticipate claim 11, and that claim 11 is in condition for allowance. Since claims 12, 14, and 16-

19 depend from claim 11, Applicants contend that claims 12, 14, and 16-19 are likewise in condition for allowance. However, the Examiner has already indicated that claim 16 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Applicants respectfully contend that Kuroda does not anticipate claim 20, because Kuroda does not teach each and every feature of claim 20. For example, Kuroda does not teach "an image of a portion of the corresponding metal signal line projects across the at least one problematic opening" and "an electrically conductive strip across the at least one problematic opening, wherein the electrically conductive strip includes the image", based on the same arguments presented *supra* in relation to claim 1.

In addition, Kuroda does not teach a design step of: "designing the dielectric laminate to include at least one dielectric substrate and at least one metal voltage plane, wherein a first metal voltage plane of the at least one metal voltage plane is laminated to a first dielectric substrate of the at least one dielectric substrate". Kuroda does not teach any design method step.

In addition, Kuroda does not teach a design step of: "determining where in the at least one metal voltage plane to place openings for venting of gases generated during fabrication of the dielectric laminate". Kuroda does not teach any design method step.

In addition, Kuroda does not teach a design step of: "determining at least one problematic opening of the openings, wherein the at least one problematic opening is above or below a corresponding metal signal line within the dielectric laminate such that an image of a portion of the corresponding metal signal line projects across the at least one problematic opening". Kuroda does not teach any design method step.

In addition, Kuroda does not teach a design step of: "designing the at least one problematic opening to include an electrically conductive strip across the at least one problematic opening, wherein the electrically conductive strip includes the image". Kuroda does not teach any design method step.

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully maintain that Kuroda does not anticipate claim 20, and that claim 20 is in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully believe that all pending claims and the entire application meet the acceptance criteria for allowance and therefore request favorable action. If the Examiner believes that anything further would be helpful to place the application in better condition for allowance, Applicants invites the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below. The Director is hereby authorized to charge and/or credit Deposit Account 09-0457.

Date: 06/21/2004

Jack P. Friedman
Jack P. Friedman
Registration No. 44,688

Schmeiser, Olsen & Watts
3 Lear Jet Lane, Suite 201
Latham, New York 12110
(518) 220-1850

Serial No.: 10/042,031

15